

I reckon you kin. There are seven on us to hum, and we all have the ager like blazes, and have took lots of stuff to cure it, but 'taint no use, we all shake in spite of physic, and I have concluded to get insured. So what'll yer charge to insure seven on us and Old Towser?

'You mistake,' said the President trying to repress a laugh.

'No, I don't want any mistake; I want to insure so none of us will have the cussed shakes any more.'

'You don't understand,' answered the President.

'Yes, I understand,' continued the Hoosier, a little piqued at not receiving a definite answer. 'I see by yer sign that yer insure health, and that's what I want.'

The President here explained the objects of the Company, and the Hoosier left the office muttering—

'Dod darn'd putty Health Insurance Company that can't insure a feller agin the ager.'

# THE POLYNESIAN.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1852.

## Candidates for the January Elections.

Although but little apparent interest has been exhibited on the subject, in which the public have engaged, we find, on inquiry, that a good many candidates are in nomination, either by themselves or their friends, for the offices of representatives of the people and road supervisors, in the various districts of the islands. So far as we have been able to ascertain, the following are the candidates. There may be others, but if so, they have not come to our knowledge. We shall be happy to publish their names if made known to us.

## FOR REPRESENTATIVES, Island of Oahu.

A. G. Thurston, Makalea and J. W. E. Maikai Honolulu.

J. M. Smith, Opunui and Kekioa, Ewa.

G. M. Robertson, Waiailua.

H. H. Rice and Ukeke, Koolauloa.

H. Dimond and Pili, Kaneohe.

## Island of Kauai.

S. P. Kalama, Hanalei.

E. P. Bond, Nawiliwili.

Lilikalani, Kolon.

## Island of Maui.

Timoteo and Kammea, Lahaina.

Kaunapali, L. S. Us, Lahaina.

John Richardson, Waikapu.

Kauaiwa, Makawao.

Kamakau, Hana.

Kamapikane, Island of Molokai.

Pali, Island of Lanai.

## Island of Hawaii.

Baranaba, Puna.

Laanui, Kau.

Haania, Kona.

## FOR ROAD SUPERVISORS.

D. Lima, Honolulu.

Opunui and Kekioa, Ewa.

George Williams, Koolauloa.

J. Kalili, Koolapoko.

We have no information from the other islands, in relation to the candidates for road supervisors. As local offices, they will doubtless be briskly contested, but the names of candidates have not been communicated.

The election for these offices takes place on the first Monday in January, which will be the 3d of the month. That also, is the day for the commencement of the January term of the Supreme Court, which will probably immediately adjourn on account of the election. "No civil process can be served in any district of this kingdom, on any person entitled to vote therein on that day of election for representatives."

"The District Justices, the Tax Collector, and School Inspector of the district, or in their absence, agents appointed by them for the purpose, constitute the board of inspectors to conduct the election and decide on the qualification of voters. The district justice who has been longest in office, or his agent, shall be chairman of said board."

"The polls shall be opened, and proclamation made thereof, at eight o'clock in the morning on the day of election, and shall be kept open until five o'clock in the afternoon, and no longer."

"After the close of the polls, the inspectors shall proceed without unnecessary delay to count the number of votes given for the different candidates respectively, and all persons who choose to attend at such counting of votes shall be at liberty to do so."

"Every male subject of His Majesty, whether native or naturalized, and every denizen of the kingdom, who shall have attained the full age of twenty years, and who shall have resided on these islands for one year immediately preceding the election, shall be entitled to one vote for a representative of the district in which he may reside. Insane persons, and those who have been convicted of an infamous crime, and unpardoned, are not allowed to vote."

The polls of Honolulu will be held at the Court House, that place having been designated by the Sheriff of Oahu, whose duty it is to appoint the place and notify the public of the same, which he has done, as will be seen by reference to his advertisement in another column.

The new Constitution makes it necessary for the legislature to meet every year, which is a matter of very questionable necessity, as we apprehend. Biennial sessions, unless for some special cause, would much better subserve the public interests of the nation, than annual. Not the least of the disadvantages of annual sessions is, requiring all the Governors of other islands to visit the metropolis, and leave their official duties unattended to at home or committed to a substitute.

Other officers of government are usually the choice of the people as their representatives, and these, too, cannot well be spared from their other duties to attend the legislature; and yet, in some districts, there are no other persons so well qualified as they for representatives of the people, both for their integrity and intelligence.

With a little fore-cast, all the business could be done for two years, about as well and as soon as for one, thus saving much time, inconvenience and expense. Precedents are not wanting in states of a much larger population, and more complicated affairs, where their legislatures meet but once in two years, and what urgent necessity is there for annual meetings here? We submit it to the proper authorities to inquire into this matter, and if found desirable, take the proper steps for having it so, by amending the constitution to that effect.

REMOVAL.—The office of the Land Commission has been removed to the first floor of the new Court House.

## Wreck of the "A. H. Howland."

In giving an account of the wreck of the above named ship in our last paper, it appears we gave occasion to Capt. Pease and the agents of the ship, to issue certain documents, which will be found in another column, and to which we very cheerfully give place.

In giving attention to the remarks we published, our sole motive was, by stating the facts in the case, to shield the reputation of the port of Honolulu from the imputation of being an unsafe harbor, which the occasional wreck of a vessel upon our coast might give it abroad. And in justification of our own views on this point, we could bring the testimony of scores of witnesses, whom we have heard assert, repeatedly, that most, if not all the wrecks which have occurred off this harbor for the past ten or fifteen years, might have been prevented, had proper caution been exercised, and safety sought in season. This assertion does not, necessarily, involve the Captains of those ships in a culpable dereliction from duty. They may have erred in judging of the danger. In some cases we know they have been almost ready for sea, and have thought that they could finish their business and get off before the gale set in. They have not wished to incur the expense of pilotage, and the loss of time consequent upon coming into the harbor, where they would have been safe. But when a ship is lost, under such circumstances, we ask if it is not a wreck that is unnecessary? Should a wreck of this nature be set down as against our harbor or roadstead? By no means. The few hours employed in closing up business, as in the case of the Oscar, or in getting off stores, as in the case of the Patapoco, or in getting the last load of bone ashore, as in the case of the A. H. Howland, were amply sufficient to have placed those vessels in safety, when a southerly storm was evidently brewing, which would almost inevitably wreck every vessel at anchor outside. We need not refer to the loss of the Charles Drew; that was a case of carelessness, which we have heard no man attempt to justify. She run on in a moonlight night, with the wind off-shore, through the misconception of the mate in charge in regard to his proximity to the land. A more careful man would have made sure of his safe distance, as there was no occasion whatever for his coming so close in.

We have no controversy with the CARO so respectfully signed by ship masters in port, and by no means impeach their motives in attaching their names to such a statement. We simply deny that any statement of ours were calculated to make a false impression either here or elsewhere. But we would respectfully ask, not only the shipmasters whose names there appear, but the pilots, harbor master and the ex-pilots of this port,—all experienced men in such matters,—whether, if a signal had been set for a pilot during Monday, the 6th of December, the "A. H. Howland," could not have been safely brought into the harbor before dark? And we also ask, whether,—on finding the ship could not get under way by her own exertions,—if a signal had been set for a pilot, and the ensign hoisted in the mizzen rigging, union down, a pilot would not have instantly gone off, and a hundred well-manned boats from the large fleet in port, would not have gone immediately to her aid; and, as "there was not wind enough to fill the sails," whether this force could not have towed her into the harbor in half an hour? Unless we have greatly mistaken the expression of public opinion on this point, there are very few in this community who do not believe the "A. H. Howland" might have been saved, any time on Monday, without the interposition of a miracle.

In this opinion we are sustained by the following ex-pilots and harbor master of Honolulu.

"Honolulu, Dec. 15th, 1852.

E. O. HALL, Esq.

Dear Sir:—In reply to your letter of this date, we beg to state, that in our opinion the ship "A. H. Howland," might have been brought into this port with perfect safety, at any time between sunrise and sunset, on the 6th instant, had she made any signal for a pilot."

H. J. HOWLAND, } Pilots.

GEO. H. LUCE, } Ex-Pilots.

JOHN MEEK, } Ex-Pilots.

D. P. PENHALLOW, } Ex-Pilots.

JOS. MAUGHAN, Harbor Master.

Nothing can be more specific than this; and it is the testimony of men, of all others in this community, the most entitled to consideration, from the fact that they are perfectly conversant with all the facts in the case, and know what they assert. Some of them have repeatedly brought in vessels under worse circumstances than attended the ship in question, and are sure that they could have brought her in, had they been signaled for that purpose. What then becomes of the statement, "that all that could be done to get the ship under weigh during the afternoon of the 6th instant, was done, and that the accident to the vessel could not have been prevented, unless by divine interposition."

A ship "pitching bowsprit under" on a lee shore, with a safe harbor half a mile to leeward of her, and yet not a signal even set for a pilot!

Thus much in regard to the necessity of the loss of the ship. On the subject of the rate of salvage,—a point introduced by Messrs. Condy & Co., and not by us,—we shall merely introduce the following translation of a communication received from His Excellency, the Governor, and only state, that the correspondence with Messrs. Condy & Co., it will be observed, was on the 10th, three days subsequent to his first boarding the ship, and two days after having been "ordered to desist" by the Captain.

Honolulu, Dec. 15th, 1852.

Salutations to you, the Editor of the Polynesian.

It having been stated to me that certain disputes have arisen respecting the wrecked ship, and that my name has been used, I take the liberty of explaining my own conduct.

Early on Tuesday morning I received a note from the Marshal informing me that the ship had been abandoned by all the people, and suggesting that I should take measures to save the property for the benefit of all concerned.

I therefore despatched four fishing canoes, which were soon followed by four boats and a large double canoe in which I went myself. There were in all 65 strong men. There was no person on board the ship. I placed Capt. Antoni with five men on board, who remained all that day and all night. We saved broken spars, sails, one boat, the chronometer and nautical instruments.

Next morning, (Wednesday,) I sent off to the ship 150 men, who rigged shaws preparatory to removing the cargo. I then procured of James Robinson & Co. a heavy anchor and chain, with which I intended to get the ship afloat. While these preparations were going on, I was informed

that the Captain had posted a notice forbidding any one to go on board. The Captain also went off, on Wednesday morning, and ordered the people to desist from their work under penalty of damages to the full value of the ship and cargo, if they did not leave the ship and return on shore. As soon as I heard this, I repaired to the ship and called away the men. This was Wednesday.

My only motive in meddling with this business was, agreeably with the treaty with Commodore Jones, to render prompt and efficient assistance to an American ship in fact abandoned, and I stated to the Marshal I should make no charge, but would save as much as possible, and be satisfied with whatever should be awarded, if it was no more than one-tenth. I likewise stated as much to the Consul.

When called on to make a definite bargain without regard to comity, I made the terms as stated; but that was three days after I had received my men from the ship.

I know nothing of any natives having been sent to the ship by the order of the Captain. I am sure none came on board.

Signed,

M. KEKUANAOA.

With the above remarks, and simple statement of facts, we leave the subject to the judgment of the public, and merely add, that the Hawaiian Statutes on this subject read thus:—"If any foreign vessel be in difficulty, be wrecked or in suffering from a severe storm, or if in straits of any other kind, it shall be the duty of the Governors and all local authorities and all the people to aid with all their ability him who is thus distressed. And they shall receive their pay by salvage of a part of the property rescued by them. If there be no previous contract, and the owner of the property and those who saved it do not agree, then referees shall be appointed to decide the amount of reward."

See also Section 12, of the late treaty between the United States and this Kingdom.

## Declaration of the New Constitution.

The 104th Article of the Constitution itself designated the 6th day of December, as the time when it should go into effect, and accordingly it was publicly proclaimed in the Stone Church, by the Governor of Oahu, in the Hawaiian language, and in English, by W. C. Parke, Esq., Royal Herald by special appointment for the occasion, in the following words:

## PROCLAMATION.

(Translation.)

We hereby PROCLAIM the New Constitution granted by us, by and with the advice and consent of the Nobles and Representatives of our People, during the last session of the Legislature, and signed by US on the 14th of June last, to be in full force, from this date.

KAMEHAMEHA—Done at Our Palace of Honolulu this day, (Monday) the Sixth of December, in the Year of Our Lord 1852, and the twenty-seventh year of Our Reign.

## GOD PRESERVE THE KING.

After the reading of the proclamation, the Governor announced that His Majesty would address those present, whereupon His Majesty was pleased to say,

Hearken, all ye people! You have just heard the proclamation of the New Constitution by the Governor; give ye heed to it. This Constitution I have granted, with the consent of my Chiefs and people, in order to promote the welfare of all my subjects. On this day it takes effect, and becomes the Constitution of my Kingdom; all laws must be in accordance with it. Let it be observed by all, for here are the rights of all defined and guaranteed. Adhere to this Constitution, one and all.

It is not with us now as in former times, when the chiefs were a few, and the people a multitude, and the people had no voice. We are now reckoned among the enlightened nations, and we must follow their example, and conduct our affairs by a constitution and laws. Hence, what you this day behold, this is my thought to you; that is all.

After the services at the church, the above proclamation was made at the New Market Square and at the corners of King and Mauna Kea streets, whither His Excellency the Governor and the Royal Herald were escorted by the military under the command of Lieut. Gen. Prince Liholiho.

A salute was fired at 12 o'clock, from the battery on Punch Bowl; the large church was filled with spectators, among whom were many foreign ladies and gentlemen, and the whole proceeding was in the highest degree creditable to a nation, small, indeed, but "now reckoned among the enlightened nations," and whose legislation, particularly upon the subjects of popular rights, education, freedom of speech and of the Press, is centuries in advance of nations a thousand years older. God preserve the King!

The clipper ship "Ellen Foster," 13 days from San Francisco, was off this port on Thursday for a few hours, her Captain came on shore but was off again and the ship on her way to Calcutta the same night. Although direct from California, she had no late papers on board. She reported the clipper ships EUREKA and SOVEREIGN OF THE SEAS, both bound here; the latter to take a cargo of oil to the United States, and the former to touch here on her way to China, with a few passengers for this port, among whom were Mr. Makee and Mr. Castle, and some others, and the mail. They are looked for hourly. She reports having had a fresh trade wind till within a day's sail of this port, which would show that our southerly wind could not have extended far. She shipped ten men at this port.

## Returned Leaking.

The American bark Magdala, Capt. Starr, returned on the 13th instant, in a leaky condition.—When the weather was rough, she required from 800 to 1,200 strokes an hour to keep her clear, and was obliged to return to repair. She will probably be obliged to discharge and leave down.

## The Kuhina Nui took the oath prescribed in the new Constitution, in presence of the King, in Privy Council on Monday, the 13th of this month.

## Mails.

A mail will be made up at the post office, for San Francisco and the United States, closing at half-past 3, P. M. this day, to be forwarded by the schooner Catherine.

For Strong's island a bag will be made up about Wednesday, and forwarded by the clipper ship "Aretic."

Ship George Baynes sailed from Boston on Tuesday for San Francisco with fifty-two passengers and about nine hundred tons of ice. The ice is for the California Ice Company, and is said to be the largest cargo ever shipped from the Atlantic.

## Daniel Webster is dead.

By the arrival on Saturday last of the Brig Orleans, the startling announcement was made that the great statesman, the profound lawyer, DANIEL WEBSTER, was dead.

The event occurred at 3 o'clock on the morning of the 24th of October, at his own house in Marshfield, and was communicated by Express to New Orleans in time for the mail steamer of the 20th from New-York, and was received in San Francisco on 26 days, and at these islands in 46 days.

The disease of which Mr. Webster died was a droopy; and its progress was of so long continuance, that all his friends were gathered about him; and stood by his bedside at the moment of his departure.

Thus are the great geniuses,—the strong men of the nation, passing away. Calhoun, Clay and Webster, the most prominent names for the last 30 years in American annals, have all, within the past year gone down to the grave, and each left a nation to mourn their loss.

The intelligence of Mr. Webster's death was received here with profound regret by his many friends, and immediately called forth the following notice from the American Consul at this port.

## NOTICE.

CONSULATE OF THE U. S., Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, Dec. 11, 1852.

TO THE AMERICAN SHIP-MASTERS IN THE PORT OF HONOLULU.

News of the most painful character has arrived this day. DANIEL WEBSTER is no more.—He died at his residence in Marshfield on the 24th of October. His life is engraven in the history of his country. His death will be mourned by every friend of liberty, and by none more sincerely than by the Americans abroad.

I feel assured that the ship-masters appreciate the noble principles which have marked his public life, and especially his policy in reference to the Commercial and Navigating interests. And as an expression of respect to his memory.

I request you to set the flag of your ships at half-mast during the day to-morrow.

I am very respectfully your ob't serv't,

E. H. ALLEN, U. S. Consul.

In compliance with the above request, the ships in the harbor, of which there were sixty or seventy, wore their ensigns at half-mast on the 12th, thus exhibiting a regret as deep as that felt by any other class of American citizens, either at home or abroad.

## Destroying Seized Liquors.

A petition, of which the following is a copy, was circulated in Honolulu, and received the signatures of 103 foreigners and 182 natives,—285 in all, which was presented formally to the Privy Council on the 12th inst. and received their action upon it.

## Petition.

HONOLULU, Nov. 26, 1852.

To His Excellency G. F. Judd, Esq., U. S. Min. of Finance.

SIR:—Whereas, the Collector General of Customs has in custody a large quantity of seized liquors, which, according to Supplement of Statute Laws, Sec. 23, are to be sold at public auction "for the benefit of the Royal Exchequer."

And whereas, we believe it would be more honorable to His Majesty's Government, and more conducive to the peace and prosperity of this community, that said liquors should be destroyed, if it can be done legally;

Therefore the undersigned beg leave, through Your Excellency, to present our humble petition to His Majesty's Privy Council, praying that that honorable body will take immediate measures, to the extent of their power, to prevent said liquors from being sold, and, if possible, to cause them to be destroyed.

The following resolution was passed on the subject by the Privy Council.

Resolved, That the authority to grant the prayer of the respective petitions this day presented to the Privy Council, that liquors now in the possession of the Collector General of Customs as confiscated should not be sold for the benefit of the Public Exchequer, as by the Constitution now vested solely in the Legislature and not in the Privy Council.

By order of the Privy Council.

LORRIN ANDREWS, Secretary.

December 13th, 1852.

## Swine! Swine!

Hotel de France, Dec. 13th, 1852.

MR. EDITOR:—I shall esteem it as a favor if you will insert an article in the Polynesian relative to the nuisance and loss I am subject to by swine entering my premises, both by day and night. Within the last 15 days, I have detained 6. The Constables take charge of them, but I get no recompense. I have only one alternative, that of selling them at auction myself, should any more commit depredation upon my property.

I am Sir, your obedient servant,

V. CHANCEREL.

REM.—On the subject of swine running at large, we think we have "done our duty." That they are a nuisance, we are fully aware, and only regret that they are not so regarded by our city authorities. The penal code, as well as the common law, indicates this, but they are a privileged class, and cannot be molested. We hope our friend of the Hotel de France will "give 'em fits" if they come into his enclosures again; to "give 'em beans" would be but "casting pearls before swine." They would not eat 'em.

## SUPERIOR COURT.

B. W. C. J. WHITTIT, Esq., Decision of Chief Justice Lee.

HENRY MILLER.

This is a motion for a new trial, on the ground that the Court was in error in charging the Jury that the certificate of marriage introduced by the plaintiff on the trial, in connection with the proof of the identity of the persons therein named, might be sufficient to make out the marriage, and that it was a question for the jury, under all the circumstances, to say whether the marriage had been proved, inasmuch as the certificate is simply a statement of fact, and not a certified copy of a record, and therefore extra-judicial, and not admissible evidence to the jury.

On mature reflection, I am of the opinion that a Minister's certificate of marriage, unless it purports to be a copy of the record which the law requires him to keep of all marriages solemnized by him, is not admissible evidence, in cases of criminal conversation, to prove the marriage. The law requires no such certificate to be given by officiating clergymen, and when given, as in this case, without any reference to his marriage record, it is a mere statement, inferior to his oath, and in the absence of any statute making it admissible evidence should not be received. Marriage in criminal cases and in cases like this, which are criminal in their nature, should either be proved by the person solemnizing such marriage, by persons present on the occasion, and who can identify the parties, or by the production and proof of the marriage record and proof of the identity of the parties, or in some other mode, equally direct and clear. In foreign marriages the proof required is much less, and my remarks are entirely applicable to domestic marriages. Marriage may also be proved in civil cases.

Honolulu, Dec. 12, 1852.

11-32

## JUST RECEIVED AND AUCTION, and Miscellaneous Goods and also, do, do, porter in pants, by H. ROBINSON, at A. P. Everett's auction room.

ALSO ON HAND.

10 gallon casks of Brandy, Gin &c., suitable for ship's stores, and put on board free of duties, permits &c.

Honolulu, Dec. 18, 1852.

ses, not criminal in their nature, by reputation, declarations, and conduct of the parties, and other circumstances, usually accompanying that relation.

But though the Court allowed the marriage certificate in this case to be read to the jury as collateral proof of the marriage, yet that does not afford good ground for granting the motion for a new trial. The marriage was clearly proved by the evidence of two persons who were present and saw it solemnized, and are well acquainted with the parties, so that, independent of the certificate, the jury were bound to find the marriage duly proved. The evidence of the witnesses present at the marriage proved everything requisite in the case, and was the very highest evidence that could be offered. The reading therefore of the certificate, was an act of no consequence whatever, so far as the verdict is concerned. It is a well settled principle of law, that a new trial will not be granted, on the ground of the admission of improper evidence on the trial, unless there be probable grounds to believe that injustice has been done by the admission of such testimony. No such ground exists in this case. The Court in *Cravay vs. Sprague*, (12 Wendell's Rep. 47) says, "To induce the granting of a new trial, there should be strong probable grounds to believe that the merits have not been fully and fairly tried, and that justice has been done." In *Heming vs. Gilbert*, (3 Johns Rep. 582) the court observed, "When a question on the misdirection arises, the first enquiry is, whether it was in a material point and affected the merits of the case. The court always makes this enquiry, and they are bound, in the exercise of a sound discretion, so to do; otherwise, there would be no end to new trials, and the remedy would be worse than the disease." The Courts will not set aside a verdict on account of the admission of evidence which ought not to have been received, provided there be sufficient evidence without it to authorize the finding of the jury.

*Bacon's Abridgment, Trial (L) 1* Taunton, 12. Other authorities for denying a new trial in cases like the present are 2 Term. Rep. 4, 3 East 453, 8 East 351, 9 Pick. 176.

It being decided that the admission of the certificate worked no injustice to the defendant, and affords no ground for a new trial, let us proceed to the remaining point made, namely: a new trial should be granted on the ground of excessive damages.

In general, a new trial will not be granted on the ground of excessive damages in an action for criminal conversation. It is an action of *torii* widely different from an action of contract, and one in which the jury have a greater latitude than in most other civil actions. In actions like this, before the court would be warranted in granting a new trial, they must be satisfied that the jury acted under the influence of undue motives, or of gross error or misconception of the subject, and nothing appears to lead us to such a conclusion. Though the damages are higher than I might have been inclined to find, had I been on the jury, yet they are not what I call excessive damages, which means such damages as outrage justice. There is nothing in the verdict of \$2500 for the plaintiff, to induce me to believe that the jury were influenced by undue motives, or that in finding this sum, they overstepped the bounds of right and reason. That the court has the power to set aside verdicts for excessive damages in actions of *torii* there can be no doubt, but in cases like the present, the party complaining of an excess of damages must make out a very strong case for relief, before a new trial will be granted. In the case of *Wilford vs. Berkeley*, (1 Burr. R. 609) the court refused to grant a new trial where there was a verdict for the plaintiff with \$5000 damages, though it appeared by the report of Lord Mansfield, before whom the case was tried, that the jury were induced and seduced the defendant, and that the defendant was in low circumstances, being only a clerk in the Exchequer, during pleasure, at a salary of £50 a year, which was his whole subsistence.—Lord Mansfield in refusing a motion for a new trial observed, "The jury had all the circumstances under their consideration, and in an action founded upon *torii* they are the proper judges as to the quantum of damages." The case of *Duberly vs. Gunning*, (4 Tenn. R. 651) was a harder case if possible than the last, and Lord Kenyon and a majority of the other judges supported the doctrine laid down in *Wilford vs. Berkeley*. Lord Ellenborough in the case of *Chambers vs. Catfield*, (8 East. 256) refused to set aside the verdict, where the plaintiff's wife was living separate from her husband, under a deed of settlement, securing to her a separate maintenance, and the jury gave £2000 damages, because it did not appear that the jury acted under the influence of undue motives or of gross error or misconception. We see nothing in the present case to justify the court in stepping between the defendant and the jury, and the motion is therefore denied. The more modern authorities, which will be found collected in *Bacon's Abridgment*, under the title of *Trial (L)* sustain the doctrine laid down by Lord Ellenborough.

## Boston Clipper Ships.

The new clipper ship "John Gilpin," now at the Grand Junction Rail Road wharf, East Boston, is to sail next week for New York, to load in E. B. Sutton's Despatch line for California. She is a splendid vessel of 1085 tons, constructed in the best manner, regardless of expense, and is well worth examining. She was built by Mr. Samuel Hall, the builder of the famous ships *Surprise*, *Game Cock*, *Race Horse*, &c., and is the third vessel he has built within a year for Messrs. Pierce, Hunnells & Brewer of Boston.

The first was the R. B. Forbes, of 756 tons, which has proved herself to be one of the fastest clipper ships afloat,—having lately performed a voyage round the globe, by the way of Cape Horn, Sandwich Islands, China, and back, in the unprecedented short period of seven months and fourteen days, delivering her several cargoes without a package being damaged.

The Polynesian, the second ship sailed from here in July last for California. She is a sister ship to the John Gilpin, both being built from the same moulds,—and of the same model and lines as the R. B. Forbes, but of increased proportionate dimensions and tonnage. We recommend our New York mercantile friends to examine the John Gilpin, as one of the best specimens of a Boston clipper.—*Boston Ad.*

The President has recognized Peter Kostromitoff as Vice Consul of His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, for the port of San Francisco.

## FOR SALE AT THE STORE OF J. C. SPALDING.

By the Subscriber, the following assortment of Merchandise, shortly expected to arrive by ship PHILLOMELA and EQUATOR, viz